Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/813,252	DOSHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MELVIN H. POLLACK	2445	
All Participants:	Participants: Status of Application: <u>allowance</u>		
(1) <u>MELVIN H. POLLACK</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Jenni Moen (52,038)</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: <u>17 December 2009</u>	Time: <u>2:00 PM EST</u>		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: 101 - potential signals per se			
Claims discussed: 9			
Prior art documents discussed: Specification, Pp. 4-5			
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 			
/M. H. P./ Examiner, Art Unit 2445	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Possible for claim 9, in light of Pp. 4-5 of the specification, to be construed as signals per se or carrier wave when given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Applicant has gone on record to clarify that this is not the case. Examiners amendment adding non-transitory (tangible) medium will clarify that claim 9 is not drawn towards a carrier wave.